

In the Drawings

Kindly add Fig. 4, attached herewith.

Remarks

The Applicant has amended independent claim 13. The features of claim 16 are herein incorporated into claim 13, and claim 16 is accordingly cancelled. Claims 17 and 18 are herein amended to correct dependencies. Claims 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are herein amended to clarify the claim language. No new claims are added. Thus, claims 13-15 and 17-24 are currently pending.

The Applicant has added new Fig. 4, which is a flow chart illustrating “a process for constructing an organized digital database in a traceable form in a computing system.” Support for the figure may be found at least in paragraphs 0010-0012 of the originally-filed specification. The Applicant has amended the specification, shown above, to include the features of Fig. 4. No new matter is introduced by way of the amendments.

Claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Claim 13 has been amended to correct the indefinite language and to clearly present the elements of the process. Claims 14, 15, and 21 have been amended to correct antecedent basis issues. The terms “dynamic” and “casual” have been removed from claims 14 and 24. The occurrence of “base” and “main base” in claims 15, 17, 18, 20, and 23 has been replaced with the “main database.” Claims 15 and 23 are further amended to clarify the claim language.

Claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Claim 13 is herein amended to recite “a process for constructing an organized digital database in a traceable form, wherein a computer-readable medium comprises computer-executable instructions” for performing the construction of a database. The construction of an organized digital database by

computer-executable instructions is a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,374 to Klein et al. (“Klein”). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent claim 13 is directed to “a process for constructing an organized digital database in a traceable form.” The process includes modification of “a main digital database by adding, deleting, or modifying a recording of the main database.” The modification includes the creation of a digital recording with at least a unique digital identifier for recordings and attributes of the main database; a unique digital identifier for a state corresponding to the modification of the main database; elementary values of attributes; and concerned recordings in an internal historical database. The process of claim 13 further includes “reading the main database,” which includes “receiving an original request,” “transforming the original request to construct a modified request for addressing the internal historical database,” and “reconstructing the recording or recordings” according to the original request and a target state. Furthermore, the process of claim 13 recites that “the main database comprises at least one table with organized development links between the unique digital identifiers of successive and alternative states of the main database.”

Thus, according to the process of claim 13, a main database may be modified, and upon the modification, a digital recording is created to track the original content of the digital database, which is added to an internal historical database. A reading operation includes the transformation of a request to address the internal historical database so as the digital recording may be reconstructed according to the request. Additionally, organized development links between states are included in the main database.

Klein is directed to database access at a requested query time. A transaction identifier is

assigned to a transaction that effects data values stored in the database. When a transaction changes a data value in a database block, a “database engine creates an interested transaction entry” and stores the interested transaction entry in the database block. With each transaction, “a new database version is created” (column 2, lines 38-50). Klein is further directed to operations in a read-implemented database where row data changes are made. A record is kept of transactions involving changes to row data. Transaction identifiers are assigned to such transactions. Again, database versions are created with transactions that effect changes in data of the database. “A logical select operation is executed on the database for row data values as of a query time” (column 3, lines 18-41). The previous row data may be retrieved.

In Klein, a previous database block may be retrieved even if changes are made to data by creating database versions. However, Klein fails to teach that the modification of a main database includes the creation of a digital recording with at least a unique digital identifier for recordings and attributes of the main database; a unique digital identifier for a state corresponding to the modification of the main database; elementary values of attributes; and concerned recordings in an internal historical database. In fact, Klein teaches transaction identifiers assigned to a change in the database but does not disclose identifiers for attributes of the main database and for a state corresponding to the modification of the database, as is recited in claim 13. Moreover, the database of Klein does not include “at least one table with organized development links between the unique digital identifiers of successive and alternative states of the main database,” as does the database of claim 13. Thus, in Klein it is not possible to obtain links or related events between digital identifiers of different states.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above differences set forth with respect to Klein are such that Klein fails to result in a process that contains each and every claimed aspect of the

subject matter recited in pending claims 13-15 and 17-24. The Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable over Klein.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/EEP
(215) 656-3381